



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/672,363	09/28/2000	Juhnyoung Lee	YOR920000674US1	7560
29683	7590	03/24/2004		EXAMINER
HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP				KIANERSI, MITRA
4 RESEARCH DRIVE				
SHELTON, CT 06484-6212				

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/672,363	LEE, JUHNYOUNG
	Examiner mitra kianersi	Art Unit 2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 September 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed Jan/12/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Lee et al. (U.S. 6,601,100) reference a related application 09/238,238 at col. 1, lines 8-14, and at col. 11, lines 2-11, as teaching "an aggregation system and method having general applications in the analysis of Web site performance" with the correct serial number is 09/238,348, filed on January 27, 1999 has been acknowledged by the examiner. On page 7, lines 20-26 respective parts of the Lee et al. reference (col 11, lines 53-61) cited by the examiner have been repeated. On page 8, lines 1-6, the applicant is agree on Lee et al. reference (U.S. 6,601,100) failing to teach an "analysis Is data window that has analysis data about the effectiveness of the respective product page, the type of analysis data determined by a type of analyst that uses the interface and the analysis data window presented in proximity to the respective product page."

On page 8, lines 7-18, applicant does not agree on motivation to combine Lee et al. (U.S. 6,601,100) and Jammes et al. (US. 6,484,149) and on page 8, lines 19-27 through page 10, lines 1-16 respective parts of the Jammes et al. reference cited by the examiner have been repeated. On page 10, lines 17-29 and page 11, lines 17-29 and page 11, lines 1-2, argues that Based on the foregoing, it is not seen how the teachings of Jammes et al., as they relate to a navigable hierarchy of displayed Web pages, supplies the missing disclosure in Lee et al. (U.S. 6,60 1,100) that would lead one skilled in the art to the claims of the subject patent application, such as the independent claims 1 and 11.

Lee et al. fail to disclose an analysis data window that has analysis data about the effectiveness of the respective product page, the type of analysis data being determined

Art Unit: 2143

automatically by a type of analyst that uses the interface and the analysis data window presented in proximity to the respective product page.

However, Jammes et al. discloses a top-down menu approach wherein an initial catalog page appearing on a consumer's computer screen lists general product categories, where the user selects one of the general categories, another page appears on the computer screen presenting a narrower subordinate menu of product lines. Thus, a user navigates from high-level menus to lower level menus, eventually reaching a page that describes an individual product. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ Lee et al. method and system for collecting and analyzing information about content requested in a network environment with Jammes et al. method of viewing product information for generating web pages, because it is not only easy for analysts to understand, but also, allows them to reach a particular product in a convenient and timely manner.

For example, and referring to claim 1, the proposed combination of Lee et al. (U.S. 6,601,100) and Jammes et al. does not expressly disclose or suggest an "analysis data window that has analysis data about the effectiveness of the respective product page", in combination with "the type of analysis data determined by a type of analyst that uses the interface", and "the analysis data window presented in proximity to the respective product page." The hierarchical, iconic graphical user interface of Jammes et al., which is directed to Web page design and updating functions, clearly does not render obvious the display of analysis data about the effectiveness of a product page, in an analysis data window in proximity to the product page, where the type of analysis data is "determined by a type of analyst that uses the interface". Jammes et al. appear to simply identify individual customers using the Consumer ID from a cookie and, based on the customer's previous interaction(s), may notify the navigable electronic store hierarchy presented to that customer.

Jammes et al. On col 39, lines 57-65, disclose that the Merchant Workbench automatically generates a value for the merchant ID field 1322, which is constant for every product offered by a particular merchant. A merchant enters a Product_ID value

1324 and a Product_Name value 1326. The merchant also enters a unit price 1328 and a unit size value 1330.

The merchant determines the effective time period for the product by entering a value in the effective date field 1332 and determine when a product will expire by entering a date in the expiration date field 1334. Applicant on page 11, lines 5-9, disclose that there is no disclosure or suggestion in either Lee et al. (U.S. 6,601,100) or in Jammes et al. of determining a "type of analyst", and subsequently determining what analysis data to present in an analysis data window based on the type of analyst. The Examiner's general references to a "top-down menu approach" and being able to navigate "from high-level menus to lower level menus", etc., certainly does not teach or suggest the subject matter that is actually claimed in claim 1 (or 11), as filed.

Jammes et al on col 17, lines 11-26 disclose a method where the query associates a value of "G" with the parameter "ID_Type", the value "1000" with the parameter "ID", and the value "Contains" with the parameter "Relationship". If the root level group My Store 320 is represented in the group table 206 by a data record of type "G" (group) having a unique ID value of "1000", it will thus be appreciated that the above query may be used to retrieve data from all data records related to the root level group My Store 320 by a "Contains" (i.e., contained within) relationship.

Applicant on page 11, lines 10-13 argues that a merely clarifying amendment has been made to independent claim 1 to state that the type of analysis data is "determined automatically by a type of analyst that uses the interface". This clarifying, amendment also serves to even further distinguish the claimed invention from the Examiner's proposed combination of Lee et al. (U.S. 6,601,100) in view of Jammes et al. Jammes et al. On col 4, lines 28-34 disclose that when the Merchant Workbench stores information indicating that particular products (cross-sale products) are often sold together. Consumers ordering one of such products are automatically presented with links to web pages describing related products.

Regarding claim 2, applicant argues on page 11, lines 15-25, has specified the "type of analyst" any one or more of the following: "an administrator, a marketer, a merchandiser, a Web designer, a store owner of the online store, a system analyst, a product analyst, and a sales analyst." Web designers, marketers and creative designers cited in Lee et al. reference in col 3, lines 31-35 can be considered as "type of analyst". Applicant on page 12, lines 1-5, argues that the proposed combination of Lee et al. (U.S. 6,601,100) in view of Jammes et al. do not teach or suggest an analysis data window as is claimed in claim 1, then the claimed types of analysis data displayed in such a window , where the type of analysis data is "determined automatically by a type of analyst that uses the interface", is certainly also not disclosed or suggested.

Jammes et al. On col 4, lines 28-34 disclose that when the Merchant Workbench stores information indicating that particular products (cross-sale products) are often sold together. Consumers ordering one of such products are automatically presented with links to web pages describing related products. Regarding claim 11, the type of analysis being determined automatically by the user's user class, Jammes et al. On col 4, lines 28-34 disclose that when the Merchant Workbench stores information indicating that particular products (cross-sale products) are often sold together. Consumers ordering one of such products are automatically presented with links to web pages describing related products.

All the dependent claims are also not allowable for the reasons mentioned above regarding the independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Art Unit: 2143

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (US 6,601,100), and further in view of Jammes et al. (US 6,484,149)

1. As per claim 1, Lee et al. discloses a computer interface to an online store comprising:

-one or more product pages that have product information about one or more products, the product information obtained from the online store; (abstract) and (col 8, lines 5-11).

Lee et al. fail to disclose an analysis data window that has analysis data about the effectiveness of the respective product page, the type of analysis data being determined automatically by a type of analyst that uses the interface and the analysis data window presented in proximity to the respective product page.

However, Jammes et al. discloses a top-down menu approach wherein an initial catalog page appearing on a consumer's computer screen lists general product categories, where the user selects one of the general categories, another page appears on the computer screen presenting a narrower subordinate menu of product lines. Thus, a user navigates from high-level menus to lower level menus, eventually reaching a page that describes an individual product.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ Lee et al. method and system for collecting and analyzing information about content requested in a network environment with Jammes et al. method of viewing product information for generating web pages, because it is not only easy for analysts to understand, but also, allows them to reach a particular product in a convenient and timely manner.

2. As per claim 2, Lee-Jammes disclose the invention substantially as claimed including where the type of analyst includes any one or more of the following: an

Art Unit: 2143

administrator, a marketer, a merchandiser, a Web designer, a store owner of the online store, a system analyst, a product analyst, and a sales analyst. (Col 3, lines 31-35, Lee)

3. As per claim 3, Lee-Jammes disclose the invention substantially as claimed including where the analysis data window further comprises any one or more of the following types of analysis data: analysis data on one or more products on the product page, analysis data on one or more of the product pages, and analysis data on one or more components of one or more of the product pages. (Col 8, lines 5-11, Lee)

4. As per claim 4, Lee-Jammes disclose the invention substantially as claimed including where the analysis data window comprises analysis data on one or more products on the product page and the analysis data comprises any one or more of the following: one or more conversion rates, one or more count measure conversion rates, one or more derived measure conversion rates, one or more sales measures, one or more dimensions, one or more time dimensions, one or more customer dimensions, one or more merchandising cue dimensions, one or more shopping metaphors, one or more product category dimensions, one or more basket placement counts, one or more purchase counts, one or more return counts, a ratio of purchases to number of basket placements, a ratio of number of returns to number of purchases, a sales value, a profit, an average price, and an average profit margin. (Col 2, lines 35-43, Lee)

5. As per claim 5, Lee-Jammes disclose the invention substantially as claimed where the analysis data window comprises analysis data on one or more product pages and the analysis data comprises any one or more of the following: one or more conversion rates, one or more count measure conversion rates, a number of impressions, a number of clickthroughs, one or more derived measure conversion rates, a number of clickthroughs per number of impressions, a number of basket placements per number of clickthroughs, a number of purchases per number of basket placements, a number of purchases per number of impressions, a number of purchases per number of clickthroughs, one or more sales measures, one or more dimensions, one or more time dimensions, one or more customer dimensions, one or more merchandising cue dimensions, one or more shopping metaphors, one or more product category

dimensions, one or more basket placement counts, one or more purchase counts, a sales value, a profit, an average price, and an average profit margin.(col 2, lines 35-45, Lee)

6. As per claim 6, Lee-Jammes disclose the invention substantially as claimed including where the product page is a web browser page. (Col 4, lines 64-67, Lee)

7. As per claim 7, Lee-Jammes disclose the invention substantially as claimed including where one or more components of the product page is a hyperlink to one or more other product web pages. (element 242) and (col 7, lines 58-62, Lee)

8. As per claim 8, disclose the invention substantially as claimed, where the components of Web page displaying the selected product are any one or more of the following: one or more products, product pages, hyperlinks, Web applications, and Web design features. (col 3, line 67and col 4, line 1-7, Lee)

9. As per claim 9, Lee-Jammes disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Including an interface, where the Web applications are one or more of search, shopping cart placement, registration, checkout, mail to friend, wish lists, gift registries, calendars, custom-configuration of products, buyer's groups, chatting, e-mail notification, and in-context sales. (Col 11, lines 24-28, Lee)

10. As per claim 10, Lee-Jammes disclose the invention substantially as claimed where the Web design features are one or more of media type, font, size, color, and location. (Col 16, lines 26-29, Lee)

11. As per claim 11 (Lee-Jammes) disclose a method of doing business over a network comprising the steps of:
providing one or more product pages that have product information about one or more products on a user interface, the product information obtained from an online store; (abstract, Lee) and (col 8, lines 5-11, Lee)

and providing an analysis data window that has analysis data about the effectiveness of the respective product page, the type of analysis determined by a user that uses the

interface and the analysis data window presented in proximity to the respective product page, the user being in a user class and the type of analysis being determined automatically by the user's class and the type of analysis being determined automatically by the user's user class. (col 2, lines 34-40, Jammes)

12. Claim 12; recite similar limitation as claim 2. It is analyzed and rejected by the same rationale.

13. As per claim 13, where the user is registered to the online store by the user's role in the store. (This step is obvious, because in order to be able to login and retrieve the specific data, the user must be registered as a member).

14. Claim 14; recite similar limitation as claim 6. It is analyzed and rejected by the same rationale.

15. As per claim 15, Lee-Jammes disclose the invention substantially as claimed where the analysis data is presented in the analysis data window concurrently with and in proximity to the web browser page on the interface.

where (corresponds to a software system called "Merchant workbench" (col 3, lines 1-10, and col 2, lines 34-40, Jammes)

16. As per claim 16, Lee-Jammes disclose the invention substantially as claimed where, where the analysis data window is produced by a software program that starts automatically when the user requests the web browser page of a selected product. (Col 6, lines 7-10, Lee)

17. As per claim 17, Lee-Jammes disclose the invention substantially as claimed where the analysis data window software program automatically starts only when the user is a member of a selected user class, which affiliates with the online store. (Fig.2, and col 6, lines 28-30, Lee)

18. As per claim 18, Lee-Jammes disclose the invention substantially as claimed where the user class of the user making a request to the online store is identified by the

store before the analysis data window is provided on the interface. (Col 2, lines 16-18 and col 7, lines 8-19, Lee)

19. As per claim 19, Lee-Jammes disclose the invention substantially as claimed where the user class is examined by using a subfield of a "cookie" that is attached to the request. (Col 7, lines 3 and lines 8-11, Lee)

20. As per claim 20, Lee-Jammes disclose the invention substantially as claimed where further comprising a perusal step that automatically browses and filters a set of product pages and their analysis data based on a profile of the user. (Col 6, lines 21-25, Lee)

21. As per claim 21, Lee-Jammes disclose the invention substantially as claimed where the perusal step provides in the interface one or more criteria of filtering one or more product pages. (Col 10, lines 6-10, Lee)

22. As per claim 22, Lee-Jammes disclose the invention substantially as claimed where A method, where the criteria of filtering is based on any one or more the following: one or more attributes of the pages, one or more components of the pages, and one or more of the analysis data. (Col 10, lines 11-15, Lee)

23. As per claim 23, Lee-Jammes disclose the invention substantially as claimed where the product page perusals step automatically retrieves specified product pages and the respective analysis data from the online store. (Col 6, lines 1-6, Lee)

24. As per claim 24, Lee-Jammes disclose the invention substantially as claimed where the product page perusal step parses the content of retrieved product pages and the respective analysis data, and selects product pages that meet one or more criteria given by the user. (Col 5, lines 49-64, Lee)

25. As per claim 25, Lee-Jammes disclose the invention substantially as claimed where the product page perusal step creates a list of selected product pages that contains page name, analysis data summary, and hyperlink for each selected product page. (Col 7, lines 23-30, Lee)

26. As per claim 26, Lee-Jammes disclose the invention substantially as claimed where the user can use the list of selected product pages created by the product page peruser program to manually examine product pages and their analysis data by using a web browser. (Col 7, lines 58-67, Lee)

27. As per claim 27, A new program embodied on a computer readable medium and comprising computer program instructions for directing at least one computer to provide an interface to an online store, comprising:

First computer program instructions for defining and managing product pages each containing product information concerning at least one product of the online store; and second computer program instructions, responsive to stored data that represents a historical record of use of the product pages by customers and potential customers of the online store and that indicates an effectiveness of the product pages, to display an analysis data window in proximity to a respective one of the product pages, where a specific type of analysis data that is displayed in the analysis data window is determined automatically by determining a type of analyst that uses the interface. (at least two computers wherein the enhanced Web browser 112 runs on a first computer and the Web server 106 runs on a second computer, col 8, lines 34-45). Lee et al. fail to disclose an analysis data window that has analysis data about the effectiveness of the respective product page, the type of analysis data being determined automatically by a type of analyst that uses the interface and the analysis data window presented in proximity to the respective product page.

However, Jammes et al. discloses a top-down menu approach wherein an initial catalog page appearing on a consumer's computer screen lists general product categories,

where the user selects one of the general categories, another page appears on the computer screen presenting a narrower subordinate menu of product lines. Thus, a user navigates from high-level menus to lower level menus, eventually reaching a page that describes an individual product.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ Lee et al. method and system for collecting and analyzing information about content requested in a network environment with Jammes et al. method of viewing product information for generating web pages, because it is not only easy for analysts to understand, but also, allows them to reach a particular product in a convenient and timely manner.

28. As per claim 28, where the type of analyst is determined automatically by extracting data from a user information field of a cookie. (corresponds to permitting Web page information to be extracted on-demand from a product inventory database.

Abstract)

29. As per claim 29, a computer program, where the type of analyst is determined automatically by extracting data from a user class subfield of a cookie. (corresponds to permitting Web page information to be extracted on-demand from a product inventory database. Abstract)

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mitra Kianersi whose telephone number is (703) 305-4650. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (703) 308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-9923.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Mitra Kianersi
March/11/2004



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100